



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

MF

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/067,795 04/28/98 DOVEK M. 3123-276

022442
SHERIDAN ROSS PC
1560 BROADWAY
SUITE 1200
DENVER CO 80202

WM01/1219

EXAMINER

LETSCHER, G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2652

DATE MAILED: 12/19/00

18


Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

gk

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/067,795	Applicant(s) Dovek et al
Examiner George Letscher	Group Art Unit 2652



Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 3, 2000

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-60 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1-60 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
 received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2652

Election/Restriction

1. The restriction requirement has been withdrawn. Rejections of claims 20 and 38-41 follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13-15, 17-19, 21, 24-27, 29-34, 37, 42-50, 53, 55, 57, 58 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka et al (U.S. Patent 5,486,967) for the reasons set forth in the Office action dated April 29, 1999.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2652

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hesterman et al (U.S. Patent 5,434,733) in view of Hamilton (U.S. Patent 4,423,450).

With regard to claims 1-19, 21-37 and 42-60, Hesterman et al in view of Hamilton shows all the features except for the detector being a PR4 detector or a peak detector. Official Notice is taken that it is notoriously old and well known in the art to use a PR4 detector or a peak detector to detect a Lorentzian-shaped pulse. Applicant even admits that these detectors are old and well known on pages 22 and 23 of the specification. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the magnetic recording system of Hesterman et al in view of Hamilton with either a PR4 or peak detector. The rationale is as follows: One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to provide the magnetic recording system of Hesterman et al in view of Hamilton with either a PR4 or peak detector so that the system can read the

Art Unit: 2652

Lorentzian-shaped pulse that is produced from the head of Hesterman et al in view of Hamilton.

With regard to claims 39-41, the pulses received from the magnetoresistive element of Hesterman et al in view of Hamilton will already be substantially Lorentzian-shaped pulses since the head is a flux-guided MR head that is reproducing perpendicular recording media. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the device of Hesterman et al in view of Hamilton devoid of all signal processing circuitry between the magnetoresistive read element and the detector. The rationale is as follows: One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to make the device of Hesterman et al in view of Hamilton devoid of all signal processing circuitry between the magnetoresistive read element and the detector since the pulses received from the magnetoresistive element are already substantially Lorentzian-shaped pulses.

With regard to claims 20 and 38, Official Notice is taken that high pass filters are old and well known in the art to remove lower frequencies. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that passing the substantially Lorentzian-shaped pulses of Hesterman et al in view of Hamilton through a high pass filter would make the signal more of an ideal Lorentzian shape by

Art Unit: 2652


removing the lower frequencies. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to pass the pulses received from the magnetoresistive element of Hesterman et al in view of Hamilton through a high pass filter. The rationale is as follows: One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to pass the pulses received from the magnetoresistive element of Hesterman et al in view of Hamilton through a high pass filter so that the lower frequencies are removed and the pulses are closer to the ideal Lorentzian shape.

4. Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Somers (U.S. Patent 5,097,371) in view of Hamilton (U.S. Patent 4,423,450) for the reasons set forth in the Office action dated April 26, 2000 and the reason set forth above in the immediately preceding paragraph.

Art Unit: 2652

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to George Letscher at telephone number (703) 305-7912.



GEORGE J. LETSCHER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

December 13, 2000